by itself it contains a constant element of falsity.

Thus when we speak of an individual we mean ordinarily an individualisation of mental, vital, physical being separate from all other beings, incapable of unity with them by its very individuality. If we go beyond these three terms of mind, life and body, and speak of the soul or individual self, we still think of an individualised being separate from all others, incapable of unity •and inclusive mutuality, capable at most of a spiritual contact and soul-sympathy. It is therefore necessary to insist that by the true individual we mean nothing of the kind, but a conscious power of being of the Eternal, always existing by unity, •always capable of mutuality. It is that being which by self-knowledge enjoys liberation and immortality.

But we have to carry still farther the conflict between the normal and the higher reason. When we speak of the true individual as a conscious power of being of the Eternal, we are still using intellectual terms,—we cannot help it, unless we plunge into a language of pure symbols and mystic values of speech,—but, what is worse, we are, in the attempt to get away from the ide.a

of the ego,
using a too abstract language. Let us
say, then, a
conscious being who is for our
valuations of
•existence a being of the Eternal in his
power of
individualising self-experience; for it
must be a
concrete being—and not an abstract
power—who
enjoys immortality. And then we get to
this that